



COMMUNISM IS TREASON!

FIGHT IT WITH . . .

Common Sense®

LEADER IN THE NATION'S FIGHT AGAINST COMMUNISM

® Trade-mark registered 1948 United States Patent Office

Issue No. 441 (19th Year) Dec. 15, 1964

Second Class Postage Paid at Union, New Jersey, U.S.A.

FIVE CENTS

"The truth,
the whole truth,
and nothing
but the truth
. . . without fear
or favor"

Conde McGinley
1890 • FOUNDER • 1963

MEDICARE - SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

HOW CAN A BANKRUPT U.S.A. SUPPORT THIS WELFARE STATE PLAN?

By J. Johnston McCauley

If there is anyone who thinks we are the greatest country in the world because we are the richest and most productive, he has been misinformed. The United States is the greatest country in the world because its people enjoy a vastness of freedom never before known to mankind. It is great because, throughout its history, it has been guided by the conviction that individual rights and human personality are matters of paramount importance.

The most serious of the grave dangers our country faces today is that we will not do enough for ourselves to save our freedom, but assume a fatalist attitude, because we feel that it is futile for us to do something. The most prodigious source of this nation's economic strength is our system of competitive personal enterprise. We know this, but so does the opposition. If the free enterprise system should collapse, the entire structure that is the United States of America, will tumble down, and seizure of the entire world by Socialism would occur with only minor resistance.

A point of danger which we must recognize is to be found in the continuing growth of bureaucracy in our Federal government. This increase could lead to so much dependence on Federal aid that we shall eventually become a welfare state. It seems inconsistent to fight Socialism if we do not ourselves use every effort to curtail the growing dependence on the Federal government within our own country. The inefficiency of government in practically every business enterprise it has undertaken is a matter of record, which is exceedingly bad.

Our survival as a free nation depends upon thorough understanding of the technique utilized in bringing about a welfare state, for at the end of such a state is a police state and loss of liberty to everybody. A case in point is the matter of that Socialistic piece of legislation called, "Medicare." Right now, the proponents of this plan naturally do not call it socialistic, as they are fully cognizant that the concept of Socialism does not appeal to the majority of the people. Advocates of this plan prefer to say "compulsory health insurance." But regardless of the choice of words they may prefer to use, they are, in reality, talking about Socialized Medicine. Therefore, it would behoove us to find out all we can about this welfare state concept.

"Medicare" is a Federalized, tax-payer financed system of providing medical care. It removes that responsibility for maintaining health and taking care of medical needs from the hands of the patient into the hands of the Federal government. The tax-payers, rather than the individual patient, would become the buyer and dispenser of medical care and its attendant needs. The proponents of compulsory health insurance insult our intelligence by arguing that under this plan everyone would have free medical aid and nobody would be compelled to go to established free clinics.



Wilbur Mills



Lyndon B. Johnson



Wilbur J. Cohen

Wilbur J. Cohen, formerly Assistant Secretary for legislative matters of the Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare. Headed a task force for J.F.K. on medical care for the aged under the Social Security System, an outright socialist plan, and technical advisor to the S.S.A. 1936-1954. Present ad-

ministration expert on Medicare, part of L.B.J.'s Great Society.

Wilbur Mills, a long time foe of medicare has suddenly thrown in the sponge. Did Mills, as Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee yield to Zionist pressure?

This is deliberate deception, for where else does the Federal government obtain the money to provide the so-called "free" medical service except from the people, who actually are the government. The cost of a government system of medicine would be greater than that of a private system, for all experience proves that costs invariably rise when the government becomes involved.

Most assuredly, no one who requires medical care should be without it, but under our system of "private" rather than "political" medicine, we have come closer to this humanitarian goal than any other country including the ones who have adopted Socialized Medicine. Let us therefore spend our efforts in perfecting this progressive system, the one we already have, rather than promoting the reactionary system of putting the politician between us and our physician.

Fortunately, we do not have to rely on guesswork to obtain a clear view of what happens to medical costs and to the quality of medical care under Socialized Medicine, because we need only to take a lesson from what Great Britain is painfully learning about such a plan.

This plan has existed for about fourteen years in England. British physicians are subordinate to the bureaucrat. The science of medicine is reduced to an instrument of politics. The relationship between the doctor and patient is impersonal and inevitably becomes involved with strangling red tape, to say nothing of the lack of adequate time the physician has to devote to the individual patient. The personal relationship between doctor, druggist and patient has been put on a production basis. Participation in the program rather than the objective evidence of illness is the criterion for treatment. The judgment of bureaucrats is substituted for the judgment of physicians. And there is no question about the bureaucracy that has been established in Great Britain.

At the moment, according to the latest information, one out of every one-hundred British is employed by the Ministry of

Health, three clerks for every doctor in the British Isles. A government-operated medical system in this country would on that basis, call for the employment of an additional million clerks, and it would demand a building that would make the Pentagon look like a pill box next to a mountain.

When this socialistic plan became a law in Great Britain, back in 1948, it covered the field of health care in and out of the hospital for everybody, including free medical, hospital and dental care, free drugs and other appliances and equipment. The cost was estimated at a relatively modest 107 million British pounds annually, but this cost figure doubled the very first year, and in ten years the medical care service price-tag read 707 million pounds, quite a difference from the original estimate. Expenses increase, and the quality of medical aid decrease. Here is a description of how the patient fares, submitted by a former British citizen:

"If a person's time has more than a certain value, it does not pay him or her to use the National Health Service. So many people are resorting to the doctors' offices and hospitals that the wait seems endless. The poor are actually getting less satisfactory medical attention than they had before the institution of the Service, for in many outpatient departments, the time of waiting is doubled or tripled. And it is no joke sitting in a hospital waiting room when you are sick."

The United States has something better than Socialized Medicine and we should maintain it. Doubting Thomases need to understand this and to learn all they can about this effort. After they have convinced themselves that Socialized Medicine is impractical, expensive and last, but not least, political, they should make every effort they can to convince their representatives in both the Upper and Lower Houses of the Congress, that they do not want any part of this Socialistic plan.